

**U.S. Application No. 09/837,437**  
**Reply to Office Action dated June 3, 2005**

**RSW9-2001-0006-US1**

**REMARKS**

**I. Summary of the Office Action and this Reply**

Claims 1, 3, 6, 8, 9, 11 and 14-31 are pending in the application. The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 3, 6, 15, 19, 21, 23, and 25 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), asserting that such claims are anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,711,283 to Soenksen ("Soenksen"). The Examiner has rejected claims 8 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), asserting that such claims are obvious over Soenksen in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,717,869 to Moran ("Moran"). The Examiner has rejected claims 11, 14, 18, 22 and 24 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), asserting that such claims are obvious over Soenksen in view of the cited North article. Claims 14, 17, 25-28 and 31 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over various combinations of Soenksen, U.S. Patent No. 5,553,225 to Perry ("Perry"), U.S. Patent No. 5,263,134 to Paal ("Paal") and/or North. The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 11, 23, 25 and 26 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. The Examiner has objected to claims 16 and 22 and requested correction.

In this Reply, claims 16 and 22 are amended in accordance with the Examiner's request. Claims 1, 6, 11, 14, 23, 25 and 26 are amended for clarity without a change in claim scope in response to the Examiner's rejections under section 112. Claims 3, 11 and 18 are further amended.

**II. Formalities**

**Claim 16**

It is noted that claim 16 does not stand rejected.

**U.S. Application No. 09/837,437**  
**Reply to Office Action dated June 3, 2005**

**RSW9-2001-0006-US1**

Claim 16 is directed to a graphical user interface for displaying a user-selected portion of an image. The interface includes a slider having (1) a first portion that is superimposed over and translatable over the image, and (2) "a second portion positioned outside of and adjacent to said image." See grab bar 342, Figure 3. This is neither taught nor suggested by any of the cited art.

Accordingly, it is requested respectfully that the Examiner note that claim 16 is allowed.

**III. Response to Section 102 Rejections**

A rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102 is proper only if each and every element of the claim is found in a single prior art reference. MPEP § 2131.

**Claims 1, 3 and 6**

Independent claim 1 is directed to a method for displaying a user-selected portion of an image. The method includes "displaying a first slider . . . superimposed over said image to define a corresponding first portion of said image within a boundary of said first slider; displaying said first portion . . . enlarged relative to said image to fill said display area of said certain size."

Contrary to the Examiner's assertion on page 4 of the Action, this is neither taught nor suggested by Soenksen. The Examiner asserts on pages 3 and 4 with reference to Figure 5A that Soenksen displays an image 102 adjacent a display area 124, and that a portion 104 of the image (corresponding to a slider-defined portion 106) is displayed in the display area 124. However, claim 1 recites that the first portion of

**U.S. Application No. 09/837,437**  
**Reply to Office Action dated June 3, 2005**

**RSW9-2001-0006-US1**

the image is displayed enlarged to fill the display area. This is neither taught nor suggested by Soenksen. Instead, it is plainly apparent from Figure 5A that the zoom image portion 104 does not fill the zoom window 124. For at least this reason, Soenksen fails to teach or suggest each and every element of claim 1.

Additionally, claim 1 recites "displaying said first slider as resized, said resized first slider being displayed superimposed over said image to define a corresponding second portion of said image within said boundary of said slider; and displaying said second portion . . . enlarged relative to said image to fill said display area of said certain size." Contrary to the Examiner's assertion on page 4 of the Action, displaying an image as enlarged to fill a display area is neither taught nor suggested by Soenksen, as discussed above.

Further, the claimed method is such that resizing of the slider results in a change in size of the selected portion corresponding to the slider, and a resulting change in a zoom factor when a selected portion of a different size is displayed in a display area of a same size. This is neither taught nor suggested by Soenksen. Because Soenksen does teach or suggest redisplay of a differently sized portion to fill a same sized display area, resizing of a selected area (as determined by resizing of the zoom region 106) will not result in a change in a zoom factor of the zoom image 104 displayed within the zoom window 124. Instead, for example, decreasing the size of the zoom region 106 will result in display of a correspondingly smaller zoom image 104 within the zoom window 124. According to Soenksen, there is no change in a zoom factor of the zoom image as a result of resizing of the selected area. Accordingly, Soenksen neither teaches nor suggests the claimed invention, and in fact has an entirely different

**U.S. Application No. 09/837,437**  
**Reply to Office Action dated June 3, 2005**

**RSW9-2001-0006-US1**

principle of operation than Soenksen. For at least this additional reason, Soenksen fails to teach or suggest each and every element of claim 1.

Claims 3 and 6 depend from claim 1.

For at least these reasons, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 3 and 6 are requested respectfully.

#### **Claim 15**

Independent claim 15 is directed to a graphical user interface that includes "a display area for displaying a portion of said image, . . . a slider superimposed over and translatable over said image, . . . wherein said slider is variable in size . . . , said portion of said image filling said display area of said certain size for each corresponding scope."

Thus, the claimed method is such that resizing of the slider results in a change in size of the selected portion corresponding to the slider, and a resulting change in a zoom factor when a selected portion of a different size is displayed in a display area of a same size. This is neither taught nor suggested by Soenksen, as discussed above with reference to claim 1. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 15 are requested respectfully.

#### **Claims 19, 21, 23 and 25**

Dependent claim 19 is directed to a method for displaying a user-selected portion of an image. The method includes, after accepting user input to resize one of a first and second slider to define a second portion of an image at their intersection,

**U.S. Application No. 09/837,437**  
**Reply to Office Action dated June 3, 2005**

**RSW9-2001-0006-US1**

"displaying in a display area of a certain size said second portion of said image, said second portion of said image filling said display area." This is neither taught nor suggested by Soenksen, as discussed above with reference to claim 1.

Independent claim 21 is directed to a system including "means for displaying any selected portion of said image in said display area to fill said display area of said certain size, a scope of said portion of said image corresponding to a size of said first slider as resized."

Independent claim 23 is directed to a computer program product including "computer readable program code for displaying any selected portion of said image in a display area of a certain size to fill said display area, a scope of said portion of said image corresponding to a size of said first slider as resized."

Accordingly, independent claims 21 and 23 are directed to a system and computer program product for displaying a user-selected portion of an image. The system/product displays portions of an image selected by a resizable slider. Regardless of the size of the selected portion, the selected portion is displayed in a display area of a certain fixed size. Accordingly, any resizing of that slider, and corresponding resizing of a selected portion of that image, results in display of the resized portion in a display area that does not change in size. Accordingly, the selected portion is scaled accordingly for display in the display area of a fixed size. This is neither taught nor suggested by the cited art, as discussed above with reference to claim 1. Claims 21 and 23 are thus patentable for reasons similar to those set forth above for claim 1. Claim 25 depends from claim 23 and is likewise patentable.

U.S. Application No. 09/837,437  
Reply to Office Action dated June 3, 2005

RSW9-2001-0006-US1

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 19, 21, 23 and 25 are requested respectfully.

#### IV. Response to Section 103 Rejections

A section 103 rejection is proper only if all claim limitations are taught or suggested by the cited art. MPEP §2143.

#### Claims 11 and 25-28

Claim 11 depends from claim 1 and is likewise patentable for the reasons set forth above.

Additionally, claim 11 recites "displaying a second slider, said second slider being distinct from said first slider and being superimposed over said image, both said first slider and said second slider being displayed in two-dimensional space, said second slider cooperating with said first slider to define said first and second portions of said image at an intersection of said second slider and said first slider . . . ." This is neither taught nor suggested by Soenksen or North. More specifically, the elements of North's disclosure interpreted by the Examiner to be "sliders" are not displayed in two-dimensional space; instead they are displayed in three-dimensional space.

Claim 11 further recites "said first slider being translatable and resizable along a first axis within said two-dimensional space that is orthogonal to a second axis within said two-dimensional space along which said second slider is translatable and resizable." This also is neither taught nor suggested by North or Soenksen. Instead, the "sliders" of North are translatable and resizable, if at all, in perpendicular planes, i.e.

U.S. Application No. 09/837,437  
Reply to Office Action dated June 3, 2005

RSW9-2001-0006-US1

in three-dimensional space. Accordingly, the cited art fails to teach or suggest all claim limitations.

Claims 25-28 depend from claim 11.

For at least these additional reasons, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of claims 11 and 25-30 are requested respectfully.

### Claims 18, 20 and 22

Independent claim 18 includes recitations similar to those of claim 1 and is likewise patentable.

Additionally, claim 18 recites "displaying a second slider that is variable in size according to user input, both said first slider and said second slider being displayed in two-dimensional space, at least a portion of said second slider being superimposed over said image and intersecting said first slider within said two-dimensional space, said second slider cooperating with said first slider to define a first portion of said image at an intersection of said first slider and said second slider, said first slider being translatable and resizable along a first axis within said two-dimensional space that is orthogonal to a second axis within said two-dimensional space along which said second slider is translatable and resizable." Accordingly, claim 18 further includes recitations similar to those of claim 11, and is further patentable for similar reasons.

Claims 20 and 22 depend from claim 18.

For at least these additional reasons, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 18, 20 and 22 are requested respectfully.

**U.S. Application No. 09/837,437**  
**Reply to Office Action dated June 3, 2005**  
**Claims 8, 9, 14, 17, 24, 29 and 30**

**RSW9-2001-0006-US1**

Claims 8, 9, 14, 17, 24, 29 and 30 depend from claims believed allowable, as discussed above, and are thus likewise allowable.


Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of claims 8, 9, 14, 17, 24, 29 and 30 are requested respectfully.

### **CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants believe claims 1, 3, 6, 8, 9, 11 and 14-31 to be patentable and the application in condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully request issuance of a Notice of Allowance. If any issues remain, the undersigned requests a telephone interview prior to the issuance of an action.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: July 7, 2005

  
Gregory S. Bernabeo  
Registration No. 44,032

Synnestvedt & Lechner LLP  
2600 Aramark Tower  
1101 Market Street  
Philadelphia, PA 19107-2950  
Telephone: 215-923-4466  
Facsimile: 215-923-2189

M:\GBernabeo\bm\VP24692.usa\PatentOffice\Reply060305.doc